

REMARKS

We acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2-5, 7-9, 13-16 and 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form and to include all of the limitations recited in any base and intervening claims.

Prior Art Rejections

Maeda (U.S. 5,182,741 hereinafter "Maeda")

Claims 1 and 12 were rejected as being anticipated by Maeda. We submit that Maeda does not disclose a laser condition varying unit for altering at least one of a pulse timing and a pulse width of a laser pulse based on a clock, as recited in amended claim 1. We further submit that Maeda does not disclose a laser drive circuit for altering at least one of a pulse timing and a pulse width of a laser pulse based on a clock, as recited in amended claim 12. Rather, Maeda discloses an optical disk recording/reproducing device for varying a magnetic field and light power to be applied to an optical disk according to a recording clock frequency during recording operations by rotatively driving the optical disk at a constant angular velocity (CAV) (see abstract). Accordingly, the present invention distinguishes over Maeda. Because claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 13-16 depends from independent claim 12, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 12 are patentable.

Yoshimaru (U.S. 4,984,227 hereinafter "Yoshimaru")

Claims 6 and 11 were rejected as being anticipated by Yoshimaru (U.S. Patent No. 4,984,227). We submit that Yoshimaru does not disclose a laser condition varying unit for altering at least one of a pulse timing and a pulse width of the laser pulse based on the clock. We further submit that Yoshimura does not disclose a control unit for ... altering at least one of a pulse timing and a pulse width of the laser pulse based on the clock, as recited in amended claim 11. Rather, Yoshimaru discloses an optical disk device for recording and reproducing data to and from an optical disk using a clock signal the frequency of which is changed according to a position of an optical head while rotating a disk at a constant rate. For example, a clock

frequency increases in proportion to the peripheral speed of the disc as the writing position shifts to the outer periphery (see column 5, lines 17-22). Accordingly, the present invention distinguishes over Yoshimaru. Because claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 6, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 6 is patentable.


Maeda in view of Yoshimaru

Claim 6, 10, 17 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Yoshimaru. For the reasons discussed above, we submit that neither Maeda nor Yoshimaru disclose a laser condition varying unit having the features recited in amended claims 6 and 10, a laser drive circuit having the features recited in claim 17, and a laser drive circuit for altering at least one of a pulse timing and a pulse width of a laser pulse based on a clock, as recited in claim 21. Accordingly the present invention is not obvious over Maeda in view of Yoshimaru. Because claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 17, those claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

Enclosed is a Petition for Extension of Time (two months) and a check in the amount of \$450.00 to cover the fee. Please apply any charges, not covered, or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket Number 10449-041001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 23, 2005



Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906